

MAY 27 1969

Apt. 1-A, Escondido Village
Stanford, California 94305
May 22, 1969


Professor Joshua Lederberg
Executive Head, Department of Biology
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Dear Professor Lederberg:

I read your article in last week's Daily with great interest, not only from a general point of view, but also because of my own feelings on the long-term effects of fluoridation. I cannot speak with authority on this subject, but certainly proponents of fluoridation cannot make use of the argument that those of chloridation can that the benefits may far outweigh any possible detractions, for it is the human who is directly being treated by the fluorine. In addition, the effects of fluorine compounds seem even less well-known than those of chlorine.

If you are again called upon to write an article for The Daily, I would like to suggest a sequel on fluorine. I understand that you have previously written on this subject in your newspaper column.

Yours truly,



John H. Brownell
Graduate Student
Applied Physics Dept.

MAY 28 1969

I have been denounced on all sides for my position on this. There are, in my mind, questions about fluoride that must still be resolved. However, it is rather far down on the list of my urgent concerns. If there is any risk, it is likely to involve at most a few people with aberrant or deficient physiology in handling the fluoride ion, and the advantages are manifest. If a community actually does organize the effective distribution of fluoride to children's teeth, it is obviously following a more prudent path still. So while there are reasonable questions, I would conclude that the merits somewhat outweigh the perceived hazards. We should not neglect meanwhile to investigate these further.

If fluoride is a significant hazard, we may have to work strenuously to keep it out of many existing water supplies in communities that are not now aware of its natural occurrence!

Sincerely,
